

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 8-9, 13-14, 18-20, 23, 27-28, 32-33, 37-39, 42, 46-47, 51-52, and 56-57 are rejected as anticipated by Ellis. Claims 2-3, 5, 10-12, 21-22, 24, 29-31, 40-41, 43, and 48-50 are rejected as obvious over Ellis in view of Colville. Claims 6, 25, and 44 are rejected as obvious over Ellis in view of DeRodeff. Claims 15-17, 34-36, and 53-55 are rejected as obvious over Ellis in view of Peterka.

The Applicant appreciates the time spent by Examiner Bayard during a telephone conference with the Applicant on December 12, 2007. Pursuant to the telephone conference, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 20, and 39 to more clearly distinguish over the cited references. Claims 3, 15, 19, 22, 34, 41, and 53 have also been amended, and claims 2, 8, 9, 21, 27, 28, 40, 46, and 47 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

In view of the amendments and the Remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

Independent Claims 1, 20, and 39

As discussed during the Interview, the Applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly distinguish over the cited references. For example, claim 1 now recites that at least one request for content sent upstream over a first network is received at a headend, that the third network is physically distinct from the second network, and that the retrieved content is processed by buffering the retrieved content at the content server for delivery downstream to the user, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose, alone or in combination, a method for handling content request and delivery, comprising the steps of: receiving at a headend at least one request for content sent upstream from at least one user over a first network; sending the request for content upstream from a content server to a content library over a second network; receiving at the content server content retrieved from the content library, based on the request, and sent downstream from the content library to the content server over a third network, wherein the third network is physically distinct from the second network; and processing the retrieved content for delivery downstream to the user by buffering at the content server the retrieved content for

delivery downstream to the user.

Independent claims 20 and 39 have been amended in a similar fashion, and so are allowable for at least the reasons given for the allowability of claim 1.

Dependent Claims 3-7, 10-19, 22-26, 29-38, 41-45, and 48-57

Claims 3-7, 10-19, 22-26, 29-38, 41-45, and 48-57 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends directly or indirectly from an allowable independent claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the Remarks, each of the presently pending claims in the Application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the Application to issue. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-0629.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason S. Jackson/
Jason S. Jackson
Registration No. 56,733